DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending. The Examiner acknowledges no claims were added, amended, or cancelled.

Response to Remarks/Argument

2. Applicant's arguments filed 20 November 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant argues:

(1) The Office Action admits that the highlighted limitations above are not taught or suggested by Drake in view of Rasmussen.

The Examiner disagrees. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

(2) Sang does not teach or suggest wherein applying the determined validation rules results in one of the partially and completely validating the metadata for the object model, a partial validating of the object model allowing an existing portion of the metadata to be validated before all metadata for the object model is determined.

The Examiner disagrees. The combination of Drake, Rasmussen, and Sang teaches wherein applying the determined validation rules (i.e. *"validation criteria (such as rules which describe acceptable data values and formats) can now float with the data model, and therefore with the data values."* The Examiner understands that the when applying the concepts of validation, rules associated with validation are inherent or clearly suggested. *"The validation processes to support immediate and partial validations are as follows…when updating an XML document, check its validity by referencing the stored DTD information"* Applying the determined validation rules occur when updating an XML document and check the validity. The determined validation rules are derived from the values stored as DTD information.)(Drake, paragraph [0020], See also Figs. 3 and 4, also paragraphs [0011, 0024-0025, and 0031] teaches applying validation rules where partial or complete validation will occur; Sang, page 389) results in one of the partially and completely validating the metadata for the object model (i.e. *"Perform the update operation or not according to the validity"* The preceding text clearly indicates that when executing the step of performing update, results in one of the partially and completely validating the metadata for the object model. The use of metadata with object model is taught in Rasmussen, where *"…there is provided a method for transforming a metadata model for containing model objects."*)(Sang, page 389; Rasmussen, see at least column 4, lines 30-35), a partial validating of the object model allowing an existing portion of the metadata to be validated before all metadata for the object model is determined (i.e. *"The partial validating method need not read a whole DTD and an whole XML document, because it only validates three elements that are an updated element."* In addition, the validation unit (i.e. full validation and partial validation) may be used with validation method (i.e. deferred validation or immediate validation), therefore it reasonably Sang reasonable suggests that partial validating of the object model can be validated before all metadata of the object model is determined, by executing the step of immediate partial validation.)(Sang, page 389, 394).

(3) Sang does not teach or suggest wherein applying the determined validation rules occurs prior to deployment of the object model, a deployment of the object model allowing the object model to be used to store data according to the object model.

The Examiner disagrees and has incorporated this argument in argument (2).

(4) There is no motivation to combine Mikhailov with Drake, Rasmussen, and Sang.

The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Drake teaches data validation in a data model that is expressed using markup language notation, in which metadata is an instance of. Rasmussen teaches transforming metadata model that contains model objects. Sang teaches validating and updating parts of XML document (in which metadata is found) and updating the document in the database (i.e. data model). Mikhailov teaches creating a database schema (i.e. data model) corresponding to a receive form, publish the form for data submissions, record the data submissions in a database table or other database structure, and produce reports based on the data stored in the table. Therefore, the motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of Drake **(See *Ramussen* col. 3 lines 37-41)** with

the convenience of structured online communication as taught by *Mikhailov* **(See col. 1 lines 27-31).**

(5) There is no motivation to combine Lindberg with Drake, Rasmussen, and Sang.

The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Drake teaches data validation in a data model that is expressed using markup language notation, in which metadata is an instance of. Rasmussen teaches transforming metadata model that contains model objects. Sang teaches validating and updating parts of XML document (in which metadata is found) and updating the document in the database (i.e. data model). Lindberg teaches a relational tree that contains plurality of entities in a mark up language (such as XML) to the business object model layer and processes the entities in the mark up language. Therefore, the motivation would have been to provide a more useful way of organizing and labeling the data without changing the information model layer **(*Lindberg* paragraph [0016])** and thereby allowing for easily and efficiently sharing the data and data validation among multiple presentations **(*Drake* paragraph [0022])**.

Hence, the Applicant's arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 17, 19, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drake et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0070142 A1)(previously presented), hereinafter *Drake*, in view of Rasmussen (USPN 7,185,016 B1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Rasmussen*, and further in view of Sang-Kyun et al. ("Immediate and Partial Validation Mechanism for the Conflict Resolution of Update Operations in XML Databases." 2002) (previously presented), hereinafter Sang.

Per claim 1, *Drake* discloses a computer-implemented method of validating data in an object model **(See Title teaches validation of data model object content. Also see paragraph [0024].)**, comprising:

identifying a first subject of validation wherein the first subject is one of an object, an attribute, an association and a collection of objects **(Fig. 3 illustrates identifying a first subject of validation as social security number where the name attribute**

identifies "social_security_number". Further see paragraphs [0024-0025 and 0029]);

determining a context of data validation based on the first subject, the context including one of a) the first subject, and b) the first subject and one or more additional subjects **(See Fig. 3 and see paragraphs [0024-0025] wherein designing rules specifically for social security numbers is determining a context of data validation based on the first subject.)**;

determining one or more validation rules for each subject in the context **(See Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011, 0020, and 0024-0025] where determining rules for the subject in the context is taught.)**; and

applying the determined validation rules to each subject in the context, **(See Figs. 3 and 4, also paragraphs [0011, 0024-0025, and 0031] teaches applying validation rules where partial or complete validation will occur.)**.

Drake does not explicitly disclose the data is metadata in an object model stored in a database. However, *Ramussen* discloses metadata models and that the metadata is stored in data sources such as databases **(See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27)**.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the system of *Ramussen* including a database storing metadata to run the validation application of Drake **(See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27)**. The motivation would have been to provide

multiple users access to the validation application of Drake **(See *Ramussen* col. 3 lines 37-41)**.

Drake, in view of Ramussen, does not explicitly disclose wherein applying the determined validation rules results in one of partially and completely validating the metadata for the object model and wherein applying the determined validation rules occurs prior to deployment of the object model, a deployment of the object model allowing the object model to be used to store data according to the object model.

However, Sang discloses partial or full, i.e. complete, validation **(See Abstract of page 387 -1st page-, also page 393-394 where partial or complete validation occurs.)** and wherein applying the determined validation rules **(i.e. validation mechanism)(page 389)** occurs prior to deployment of the object model **(i.e. "Before we store or update XML documents in applications, we must verify that their structural information is valid..." "Most of XML database systems use deferred and full validation methods when XML documents are updated.)(page 389)**, a deployment of the object model allowing the object model to be used to store data according to the object model **(i.e. "We construct and store a DFA per each element declaration in DTD files." "The extracted DTD information is stored in the database for validating update operations...")(page 389)**.

Both Drake, in view of Ramussen, and Sang are directed to object validation in the art of database technology. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the cited references because Sang would have provide for performance improvement **as seen in**

Abstract and pages 393-394 – see "4 Performance Evaluation" through "4.3 Analysis of Performance".

Per claim 3, *Drake* discloses the method of claim 1, wherein identifying includes receiving an indication from a user interface module, said indication identifying the first subject **(Fig. 1 illustrates graphical user interface interaction. See paragraphs [0031])**.

Per claim 5, *Drake* discloses the method of claim 1, wherein identifying includes receiving an update indication identifying the first subject in response to a modification of the first subject **(See paragraph [0032] teaches update indication.)**.

Per claim 6, *Drake* discloses the method of claim 1, wherein each of the one or more validation rules is one of a correctness type rule and a completeness type rule, a correctness validation rule operable to be applied while partially validating the object model and a completeness validation rule operable to be applied while completely validating the object model **(See Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0004 and 0025] where validation is for correctness and/or completeness validation.)**.

Per claim 14, *Drake* discloses the method of claim 1, wherein determining one or more validation rules includes identifying rules in rule files based on the subject type of each

subject to be validated **(See rule file in Fig. 3)**.

Per claim 15, *Drake* discloses the method of claim 14, wherein each rule file is a Java file **(See paragraph [0035] where software packages is JavaBeans implying Java files)**.

Per claim 17, *Drake* discloses a data validation system for validating an object model, comprising:

means for identifying a first subject of validation, wherein the first subject type is one of an object, an attribute, an association and a collection of objects **(Fig. 3 illustrates identifying a first subject of validation as social security number where the name attribute identifies "social_security_number". Further see paragraphs [0024-0025 and 0029])**;

means for determining a context of data validation based on the first subject, the context including one of a) the first subject, and b) the first subject and one or more additional subjects **(See Fig. 3 and see paragraphs [0024-0025] wherein designing rules specifically for social security numbers is determining a context of data validation based on the first subject.)**;

means for determining one or more validation rules for each subject in the context **(See Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0011, 0020, and 0024-0025] where determining rules for the subject in the context is taught.)**; and

means for applying the determined validation rules to each subject in the context **(See Figs. 3 and 4, also paragraphs [0011, 0024-0025, and 0031] teaches applying validation rules.)**.

Drake does not explicitly disclose the data is metadata nor a database that stores the objects and metadata of the object model. However, *Ramussen* discloses metadata models and that the metadata is stored in data sources such as databases **(See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27)**.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the system of *Ramussen* including a database storing metadata to run the validation application of Drake **(See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27)**. The motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of Drake **(See *Ramussen* col. 3 lines 37-41)**.

Drake, in view of Ramussen, does not explicitly disclose wherein the means for applying the determined validation rules provides for both partially and completely validating the metadata for the object model. However, Sang discloses partial or full, i.e. complete, validation **(See Abstract of page 387 -1st page-, also page 393-394 where partial or complete validation occurs.)** and wherein applying the determined validation rules **(i.e. validation mechanism)(page 389)** occurs prior to deployment of the object model **(i.e. "Before we store or update XML documents in applications, we must verify that their structural information is valid..." "Most of XML database**

systems use deferred and full validation methods when XML documents are updated.)(page 389), a deployment of the object model allowing the object model to be used to store data according to the object model **(i.e. "We construct and store a DFA per each element declaration in DTD files." "The extracted DTD information is stored in the database for validating update operations..."")(page 389)**.

Both Drake, in view of Ramussen, and Sang are directed to object validation in the art of database technology. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the cited references because Sang would have provide for performance improvement **as seen in Abstract and pages 393-394 – see "4 Performance Evaluation" through "4.3 Analysis of Performance"**.

Per claim 19, *Drake* discloses a method of validating data in an object model, the method comprising:

receiving user defined rules, each rule defining a validation rule on a data object **(See Fig. 4 illustrates and paragraph 0031 teaches custom validation is user validation. See paragraphs [0011 and 0020] teaches receiving user defined rules. See Title and paragraph [0024 teaches validation rule on data model object content.)**, each rule being one of a completeness type rule and a correctness type rule **(Fig. 3 illustrates and paragraphs [0005 and 0025] disclose completeness and correctness type rules.)**;

storing the validation rules **(See Fig. 1 illustrates stored validation rules in data model.);**

identifying a first subject of metadata validation, wherein the first subject has a subject type selected from the group consisting of is one of an attribute, an association, an object and a collection of objects **(Fig. 3 illustrates identifying a first subject of validation as social security number where the name attribute identifies "social_security_number". Further see paragraphs [0024-0025 and 0028-0029].)**;

determining a context of validation based on the first subject, wherein the context includes the first subject and none, one or more additional subjects **(See Fig. 3 and see paragraphs [0024-0025] wherein designing rules specifically for social security numbers is determining a context of data validation based on the first subject.)**; and

applying a correctness type validation rule to each of the first and additional subjects **(See Figs. 3 and 4, also paragraphs [0011, 0024-0025, and 0031] teaches applying validation rules. See Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0004] where validation is for correctness.)**; and

applying a correctness type and completeness type validation rule to each of the determined first and additional subjects **(See Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0004 and 0025] where Drake teaches validation for correctness and completeness.)**

Drake does not explicitly disclose the data is metadata nor a database that stores the objects and metadata of the object model. However, *Ramussen* discloses metadata

models and that the metadata is stored in data sources such as databases **(See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27)**.

Drake does not explicitly disclose storing the validation rules to the database. However, Drake teaches storing validation rules in the data model **(See Fig. 1-2 and paragraph [0019])**, while *Ramussen* discloses storing the data model in a database **(See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27)**.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the system of *Ramussen* including a database storing metadata to run the validation application of Drake **(See col. 12 lines 53-55, and col. 2 lines 26-27)**. The motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of Drake **(See *Ramussen* col. 3 lines 37-41)**.

Drake, in view of Ramussen, does not explicitly disclose wherein applying the determined validation rules for correctness when only a portion of the metadata is determined; and apply for correctness and completeness when all of the metadata is determined. However, Sang discloses partial or full, i.e. complete, validation **(See Abstract of page 387 -1st page-, also page 393-394 where partial or complete validation occurs.)** and wherein applying the determined validation rules **(i.e. validation mechanism)(page 389)** occurs prior to deployment of the object model **(i.e. "Before we store or update XML documents in applications, we must verify that their structural information is valid..." "Most of XML database systems use**

deferred and full validation methods when XML documents are updated.)(page 389), a deployment of the object model allowing the object model to be used to store data according to the object model **(i.e. "We construct and store a DFA per each element declaration in DTD files." "The extracted DTD information is stored in the database for validating update operations..."")(page 389)**.

Both Drake, in view of Ramussen, and Sang are directed to object validation in the art of database technology. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the cited references because Sang would have provide for performance improvement **as seen in Abstract and pages 393-394 – see "4 Performance Evaluation" through "4.3 Analysis of Performance"**.

Per claim(s) 25, rejection of claims 14 and 19 are fully incorporated.
Claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 14 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**.

Per claim(s) 26, rejection of claims 15, 19 are fully incorporated. Claim26 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15 and 19 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**.

5. Claims 2, 4, 18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drake et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0070142 A1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Drake*, in view of Rasmussen (USPN 7,185,016 B1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Rasmussen*, in view of Sang-Kyun et al. ("Immediate and Partial Validation Mechanism for the Conflict Resolution of Update Operations in XML Databases." 2002) (previously presented), hereinafter Sang, and in further view of Mikhailov et al. (USPN 6,968,500 B2) (previously presented), hereinafter *Mikhailov*.

Per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Furthermore, *Drake* as modified by *Rasmussen* does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1, wherein each subject is a metadata object selected from the group consisting of a MetaAttribute, a MetaAssociation, a MetaAssociationEnd, a MetaClass and a MetaCollection. However, *Mikhailov* discloses a group of types of metadata associated with the corresponding database table **(See col. 5 lines 39-54, col. 14 lines 62-64, and col. 1 lines 1-31.)**

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the application and system of *Drake* and *Rasmussen* to utilize the group of types of metadata associated by *Mikhailov* **(See col. 5 lines 39-54, col. 14 lines 62-64, and col. 1 lines 1-31.)**. The motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of Drake **(See *Ramussen* col. 3 lines 37-41)** with the convenience of structured online communication as taught by *Mikhailov* **(See col. 1 lines 27-31)**.

Per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Furthermore, *Drake* and *Rasmussen* do not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1, wherein identifying includes receiving an indication from a configuration management module, said indication identifying the first subject. However, *Mikhailov* discloses automation forms handling application service **(See col. 5 lines 19-38.)**.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the application and system of *Drake* and *Rasmussen* to utilize the group of types of metadata associated by *Mikhailov* **(See col. 5 lines 39-54, col. 14 lines 62-64, and col. 1 lines 1-31.)**. The motivation would have been to provide multiple users access to the validation application of Drake **(See *Ramussen* col. 3 lines 37-41)** with the convenience of structured online communication as taught by *Mikhailov* **(See col. 1 lines 27-31)**.

Per claim(s) 18 and 20, rejection of claims 2, 17, and 19 are fully incorporated. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**.

Per claim(s) 21, rejection of claims 3, 4, and 19 are fully incorporated. Claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 3 and 4 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**.

6. Claims 7-13, 16, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drake et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0070142 A1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Drake*, in view of Rasmussen (USPN 7,185,016 B1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Rasmussen*, in view of Sang-Kyun et al. ("Immediate and Partial Validation Mechanism for the Conflict Resolution of Update Operations in XML Databases." 2002) (previously presented), hereinafter Sang, and in further view of Lindberg et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0028540 A1) (previously presented), hereinafter *Lindberg*.

Per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Furthermore, *Drake* as modified by *Rasmussen* does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the first subject is a root object for a collection of associated objects. However, *Lindberg* discloses a first subject as a root object for a collection of associated objects **(See Fig. 2 shows "Person" as the root. Also see paragraph [0016])**.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data object models to allow users of the application and system of *Drake* and *Rasmussen* where social security number is the subject to utilize the method of associating objects as taught by *Lindberg* **(See Fig. 2.)**, whereby the person could be associated with other objects by its social security number attribute. The motivation would have been to provide a more useful way of organizing and labeling the data without changing the information model layer **(*Lindberg* paragraph [0016])** and thereby allowing for easily and efficiently sharing the data and data validation among multiple presentations **(*Drake* paragraph [0022])**.

Per claims 8, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated. *Drake, Rasmussen,* and *Lindberg* discloses wherein the collection of objects is a deployable collection including all objects transitively associated with the root object **(See paragraph [0021] of *Drake.)*** and **(See Fig. 2 of *Lindberg*)**.

Per claim 9, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated. *Drake in view of Rasmussen* and *Lindberg* discloses wherein the collection of objects is an aggregated collection including the root object and all of its strongly aggregated child objects recursively **(See Fig. 2 of *Lindberg*)**.

Per claim 10, the rejection of claims 1 and 7 are incorporated, wherein determining a context includes:

a) traversing all associations with a root object to identify target objects **(See Fig. 2 of *Lindberg*)**;

b) repeating a) for each target object, with each target object as the root object **(See Fig. 2 of *Lindberg*)**; and

c) generating a list of all target objects, wherein said list of objects represents a transitive closure based on the root object **(See paragraph [0021] of *Drake* and See Fig. 2 of *Lindberg*)**.

1. **Per claim 11**, *Drake in view of Rasmussen* and *Lindberg* discloses the

method of claim 10, wherein determining a context is implemented using queries written in the Java language or a meta-language (METALANG) or both **(See Java taught in paragraph [0035] of *Drake.).***

Per claim 12, *Drake in view of Rasmussen* and *Lindberg* discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the list of objects forms the context for validation **(See Fig. 2 of *Lindberg* and paragraph [0016])**.

Per claims 13 and 22, rejection of claims 7, 10, and 19 are fully incorporated. Claims 13 and 22 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 7 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**

Per claim 16, the rejection of claims 1 and 7 are incorporated. Further, *Drake in view of Rasmussen* and *Lindberg* discloses the method of claim 1, wherein each subject in the context is one of an instance of an object, an instance of an object containing an attribute, an instance of an object having an association and an instance of root object of a deployable unit of a collection of objects **(See rejection of claims 1 and 7 above)**.

Per claim 23, rejection of claims 8, 9, and 22 are fully incorporated.
Claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 8 and 9 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**

Per claim 24, rejection of claims 10 and 22 are fully incorporated.

Claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 10 due to the similarity in scope in the limitations of the claims. **(See respective claims above.)**

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhan M. Syed whose telephone number is 571-272-7191. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/F. M. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2165

/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165